

friendliest call. He couldn't understand why I should be even questioning a bill like this and, as most of you know, I'm not the most lenient senator on the floor. My answer was, I just feel like it's too much, and that's simply it. I have no problems with the Highway Patrol, I have no problems with the sheriffs, I have no problems with the police people. One of the letters, the first one that I got, told me that, I don't know, I had too efficient a secretary or too many piles of paper on my desk, something like this, through mismanagement of the bill or the vote maybe I didn't understand, and that also the policemen and the firemen's union would be looking at me. Well, I guess that's good for them to watch. But anyhow I did and I worked up for you, if you'll notice on your desk, I did provide for you the current salaries, so it gives each of us an idea of what we're talking about. With Schellpeper's amendment, it does make the bill far more palatable to me. The gentleman that called me yesterday morning, or Saturday morning, could not see anything wrong with retiring at age 50, at 2,800 or \$3,000 a month. And then when it was all said and done we were talking, and I said, well, first you give it to teachers, and then it's the judges, and then it's the Highway Patrol, and our state budget would be very similar to the federal budget, in debt a trillion dollars because part of it, pensions that are promised. So, with that, he also told me his wife was a teacher. Readily I could figure up then, and no discredit to her, 4,500, \$5,000 a month pension at a very, very young age for that couple. Made me stop and think, and I know my taxpayers wouldn't necessarily appreciate that in the least. He mentioned the stress on the job and the work, and I don't deny that. I did happen to tell him that my husband happened to be a railroader and he worked to age 64 for half of this pension. And, boy, they didn't do half as hard a work or as much stress, and I had to kind of differ with the night work or the train or walking it. But beside the point, then it came to the point of hiring a 47-year-old woman for the job. He mentioned it first, I almost feel sorry for that woman on the job, if other officers had the same feeling as he did. But I'm sure that 99 percent of them don't. But what my amendment would do is simply, the way the bill is written now, that a survivor would get 75 percent of the patrolman's annuity. I feel that's fine, if she raised his children, four years, as the bill currently says, or had children at home, a lot of cost. Too often do I see a second marriage or so on at that age of 51, 52, 55 years of age, and that widow then could become available for 75 percent of his annuity. I might tell you, if you take the lower paid, and most all of them that are retiring are above